	Case 2:23-cv-01837-JDP Document	37 Filed 04/15/25	Page 1 of 3				
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
67							
8	LINITED STAT	FS DISTRICT COURT	7				
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALLEORNIA						
	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
10	ACCIMIA THOMAS NUTIVIN	l a v 222 1	007 IDD (D)				
11	JOSHUA THOMAS NITKIN,	Case No. 2:23-cv-1	83/-JDP (P)				
12	Plaintiff,						
13	v.	ORDER					
14	D. RADU,						
15	Defendant.						
16							
17	On January 8, 2025, defendant filed a motion to compel. ECF No. 34. Plaintiff failed						
18	either to timely file an opposition or otherwise to respond. Therefore, on March 5, 2025, the						
19	court ordered plaintiff to show cause why this action should not be dismissed based on his failure						
20	to prosecute and to comply with court orders. ECF No. 35. The court notified plaintiff that if he						
21	wished to continue with this lawsuit, he must file a response to defendant's motion. The court						
22	also warned plaintiff that failure to comply with the March 5, 2025 order would result in						
23	dismissal of this action. <i>Id</i> . The deadline for plaintiff to file a response to defendant's motion						
24	and response to the order to show cause has passed without word from plaintiff.						
25	The court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that						
26	power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal. Bautista v. Los Angeles Cnty.,						
27	216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000); see Local Rule 110 ("Failure of counsel or of a party to						
28	comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the						
	i de la companya de						

Case 2:23-cv-01837-JDP Document 37 Filed 04/15/25 Page 2 of 3

Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.").

A court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order to file an amended complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

In dismissing this action for failure to comply with court orders, the court has considered "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives." *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61 (citation omitted).

Here, plaintiff has failed respond to a court order and to defendant's motion. *See* ECF Nos. 34 & 35. Therefore, the public interest in expeditious resolution of litigation, the court's need to manage its docket, and the risk of prejudice to defendants all support imposition of the sanction of dismissal. Lastly, the court's warning to plaintiff that failure to obey court orders will result in dismissal satisfies the "considerations of the alternatives" requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The March 5, 2025 order expressly warned plaintiff that his failure to comply with court orders would result in dismissal. ECF No. 35. Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal could result from his noncompliance. Accordingly, the court finds that the balance of factors favors dismissal.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 1. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders for the reasons set forth in the March 5, 2025 order. *See* ECF No. 35.
 - 2. Defendant's motion to modify the scheduling order, ECF No. 36, is DENIED as moot.

	Case 2:23-cv-01837-JDP	Document 37	Filed 04/15/25	Page 3 of 3		
1	3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case.					
2 3	IT IS SO ORDERED.					
4 5	Dated: <u>April 14, 2025</u>		JEREMY D. PETE			
6			UNITED STATES	MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
7 8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15 16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22 23						
23 24						
25						
26						
27						
28						